

Chehalis River Basin Flood Authority **Workshop and Business Meeting 9:00 A.M.**

Montesano City Hall
112 N. Main St.

September 20, 2012 - Meeting Notes

Board Members Present: Terry Willis, Grays Harbor County Commissioner; Vickie Raines, City of Cosmopolis; Ken Estes, City of Montesano; Lionel Pinn, City of Napavine; Karen Valenzuela, Thurston County Commissioner; Dolores Lee, Town of Pe Ell (morning session); Edna Fund, City of Centralia; Ron Averill, Lewis County Commissioner; Mark Swartout, Town of Bucoda; Merlin MacReynold, City of Chehalis; J Vander Stoep, Town of Pe Ell (business meeting).

Board Members Absent: Frank Gordon, City of Aberdeen; Dan Thompson, City of Oakville

Consultants Present: Jim Kramer, Facilitator; Scott Boettcher, SBGH Partners

Others Present: Please see sign in sheet

Handouts/Materials Used:

- Agenda
- Meeting Notes from August 16
- Chehalis Work Group Recommendations
- Project Evaluation Criteria
- Funding Status for Jobs Now Act Projects
- Early Warning System Costs
- Commitment Tracking Sheet
- Discussion Document: Upcoming Flood Season Preparation

1. Call to Order and Welcome

Chair Vickie Raines called the meeting to order at 9:16 a.m. She thanked Mayor Estes for providing the meeting room and the donuts.

2. Introductions

Self-introductions were made by all attending.

3. Chehalis Alternatives Report

Mr. Kramer stated comments received on the Chehalis Alternatives Report were sent out to the Flood Authority about a week ago and that the additional comments did not change his previous summary of the comments to the Flood Authority. There was a wide range of opinions as to what should be done in the basin and personal stories constituted most of the comments. Only two jurisdictions from the Flood Authority sent comments; he asked to hear from the others or if there was a reason why they did not comment.

Commissioner Valenzuela stated the comments included criticism regarding water retention and its benefits. Those comments had to do with differing points of view such as how to manage the water down I-5. She asked what the process is for reacting to those comments and incorporating additional language, particularly about the dam.

Mr. Kramer stated a final report would be published with recommendations to the Governor for next steps. The report would be finalized in November or December. In terms of substantive changes, the team that put the report together went through the comments and flagged those that addressed the content of the report. The team will recommend changes and ask experts if the comments apply to a technical portion. Those will be brought back to the Flood Authority in October. Mr. Kramer continued to say that Larry Karpack had produced a complicated modeling spreadsheet before the report was published and there was not enough time to comprehensively assess all the information. That is not to say the report is not accurate, but that there needs to be time to go through the spreadsheet. Mr. Kramer will meet with Mr. Karpack and other experts again before the October meeting.

Commissioner Valenzuela stated she was taken by a letter submitted by a lady in her 80s who talked about her experience and wrote it all in longhand. She hoped the letter could be reproduced just that way.

Commissioner Willis expressed concern over the project labeled Hwy 6 bypass project. Grays Harbor County is concerned about how much water would be moved through that type of project and if there would be a safety feature for the lower basin.

Commissioner Averill stated there used to be a culvert that allowed the river to flow under Hwy 6 to its normal path. When Hwy 6 was improved the culvert was taken out and now the water backs up behind it and closes the highway. The recommendation is to put the culvert back so the river takes its normal course. Commissioner Averill stated Scheuber Rd is not the name of the project.

Commissioner Willis understands there would be a ditch by Scheuber Rd and a bypass at Mellen St. That is the project that is causing concern, not the Hwy 6 project. Grays Harbor County does not want the water to be dumped into the lower basin. If the report is combining the two projects there needs to be some clarification.

Commissioner Averill spoke to the report. He understands the intent of those thinking all the property can be bought up, but that would be very costly and he is not sure how to put a figure on that. Knowing what businesses and homes are currently in the flood plain, it would be billions of dollars to move them out if they want to re-establish somewhere else. While there is some merit, what would the real cost be to do that?

Commissioner Averill continued by stating that Lewis County tried to address all of the issues individually but specifically stayed out of the basin-wide solutions because they knew the Governor's committee was in the process of going through those. The Alternatives Report is oriented to the upper basin because the water starts in the upper water shed and will eventually make it to the mouth of the river. Whatever we do we are interested in preventing impacts that cause damages farther downstream and understand that the situation is different in the middle and lower river and that different projects need to be done in those areas. The Lewis County Commissioners did address the retention project on the main stem and it is important to Lewis County. A lot of time was spent on the protection of I-5 and the airport and at least five or six projects are non-starters for Lewis County. The Commissioners also discussed the Army Corps of Engineers projects and there were faults in the Twin Cities Project that were not appropriately addressed. If water retention goes in, whatever is left of the Twin Cities Project would be greatly reduced.

Commissioner Valenzuela stated in general she compliments the report. The main criticism is the insufficient analysis about water retention and its benefits. She suggested adding language about that. In the section that focuses on problematic approaches to reduce flooding locally she suggested adding information from Earth Economics which has a price tag of \$11 billion. If we decide to go to an engineered solution, what must be figured in is the economic value of lost ecosystems.

Mr. Estes stated the Montesano City Council passed a resolution supporting water retention and it has not changed that policy. He was discouraged because the public threw in opinions without knowing what was going on and there were misconceptions by the public on some of the projects.

Mr. MacReynold stated Chehalis also took an early position on retention and felt the report was a good report, not only the writing but the analysis of the situation and coming up with options for the Governor and legislature to look at. There was a concern about some of the comments and the council realized that it was a very public process and that needs to be considered. Chehalis City Council was comfortable with the report.

Commissioner Willis stated there were comments about projects on the project list. There were new projects showing up in the report that the Flood Authority had not yet discussed. One is the Wakefield culvert project outside of Elma. There is a project committee that has worked through nearly 300 projects and it was systematically given the criteria and now the report shows another project. She asked if something that is going to go to the Governor's office through the OFM process be an item that the Flood Authority has not seen.

Mr. Kramer stated Commissioner Willis was speaking of the appendix on projects and included in that are projects in the lower basin that were not discussed by the project committee. He stated dredging and bypass projects were put in the report because people kept suggesting those and since the model was done it seemed helpful for general information: here are some old ideas and here is the updated information.

Ms. Fund stated Centralia passed a resolution and the report matched where the city is going. She thought the public should comment; she did not think the report was something that the Flood Authority should look at.

Mr. Kramer committed to provide a summary of the draft responses to the comments at the October 18, 2012 Flood Authority meeting.

4. Chehalis Work Group Update

Mr. Kramer distributed a draft outline of the five basic elements to focus on for the Governor's next biennium budget that was developed by the Governor's work group. The work group has met twice; the next meeting will be on Monday, September 24. He would like the Authority to consider additional meetings to provide more specific input once the recommendations are clear. All of these elements focus on what the governor might put into her next biennium budget and are the categories that the work group is considering as they move through this.

5. Project Criteria for Evaluation of Potential Capital Projects

1. Near-term capital projects that improve local conditions by reducing flood damages and adverse impacts can be mitigated.

Mr. Kramer asked if another Jobs Now fund became available, what projects should be included for consideration? He suggested running a process through the Flood Authority using the Project Committee and Scott to come up with a list to confirm at the October meeting, probably something close to construction that would not have adverse effects. The paper he handed out had rough criteria that might help decide which projects could be put on a list.

Commissioner Averill stated he hoped the Flood Authority would be open to projects that might not be on the project list that we know are out there. The City of Centralia has a problem with China Creek and its flow was too small to qualify for the Twin Cities Project. It is a project that would be ideal for state funding and he would like to throw it into the hopper.

Mr. Kramer asked the group how it felt about projects not on the list. Commissioner Willis stated projects would be found as the Authority moves through the process. Mr. Pinn approved.

Commissioner Willis stated she did not see support in general on the criteria list – community or legislative support. She stated that while the people at the table might think it's a good idea it may not have public support.

Mr. Pinn stated financial support needs to continue to happen. It could be part of the legislation or federal money. Mr. Kramer stated he hoped that was captured in the co-funding under project costs.

Mr. Swartout stated he would like to see adverse impacts on adjacent properties or jurisdictions added. Commissioner Willis suggested adding "impacts" period.

Mr. Kramer asked for jurisdictional help if there are projects not already listed. He asked that emails be sent out to staff and reinforce that this is a high priority and there are only a couple of weeks left to do this. Regarding China Creek, there is a study already under way.

Mr. Boettcher asked about the timeline. Mr. Kramer stated since the next meeting is on October 18 the projects should be out by October 15. Mr. Boettcher stated he would send out an email to the Project Committee tonight.

Mr. Kramer asked that the criteria list be approved during the business meeting.

2. Programs and policies to ensure new development and other land management activities do not increase the risk of additional flood-related damages, and to the extent possible reduce damages and costs to existing development in the floodplain.

This item was summarized in the report copying recommendations from the Flood Hazard Plan. There was not much feedback received on those elements so Mr. Kramer asked staff from jurisdictions who had expertise in this area to meet on Monday to speak to this issue and to determine which programs were worth pursuing. Does zero rise make sense to make sure that flood risk is not increased? He needs clarity on what that means.

Mr. Swartout thought it was pretty accurate. An issue that was discussed was what does 'compensatory storage' mean? If you do an analysis, digging one hole and putting that fill somewhere else is not compensatory storage.

Mr. Kramer stated they did not go into a lot of detail about the development of the flood plain. Commissioner Averill stated a lot of studies have been done and they are still inconclusive.

3. Determine the feasibility and next steps major capital projects that significantly reduce flood damage across a large geographic area.

Mr. Kramer stated there is quite a bit of focus on water retention. What does it mean to move forward and answer questions? What is the process if we move toward constructing a dam and what is the cost? We need to understand all the questions to move it to permitting. Lewis County PUD still has EES under contract to answer those questions. The State agreed last week to co-fund a scoping effort. That is not a commitment by anyone that the dam should be built but we should know what it takes to move to construction. Included in that is the additional information needed regarding I-5 ideas and how that would work with or without a dam.

4. Develop a strategy for improving the ecological function in the Basin in conjunction with flood damage reduction projects and implement initial projects.

Mr. Kramer stated he has asked for technical experts on the fishery side and environmental experts at the Chehalis Tribe and state agencies to identify overall strategies and projects that should be considered in the next biennium.

5. Ensure flood warning and flood preparedness systems are ready and effective.

This is the work that Mr. Boettcher has been doing. There is not a proposal, rather the identification of ongoing elements to ensure they are clear and the Flood Authority is addressing the flood warning and flood preparedness suite for the Basin.

Commissioner Averill would like to ask the state to take on this role, although he was skeptical that they would. He thought it should be pursued even if it was an item in the next budget that sets some money aside. Mr. Kramer stated there is lobbying for that.

Commissioner Valenzuela stated there needs to be more conversation about this issue. Flood preparedness is a huge part of what this body can promote. It has a lot to do with how much damage we experience or avoid. The ad hoc group's primary intent is to come up with possible projects. Could one other recommendation be that the Emergency Management Service be tasked with maintenance and operation of the Early Warning System?

Mr. Kramer stated that is open. He thought the Authority would be missing something if it didn't raise that issue and say there is no structure to fund things when crossing jurisdictional lines. There will be a discussion about the research Mr. Boettcher has done on this issue. A number of programs would be non-capital programs. One discussion with Keith Phillips is if the group should be identifying those programs and is there potential that they could be funded outside of the capital budget.

Mr. Estes stated the National Weather Service uses the flood gage equipment and if there is a flood the National Guard is called out. He sees this as wider than the basin and the financial impact is pretty substantial. Some areas have good funding and others are squeaking by. He believes the state should fund this.

Mr. Kramer asked if there was anything to add to the project evaluation criteria.

Commissioner Valenzuela stated the members of the Governor's work group do not come to the table with a shared point of view so the conversations can be contentious. She thought the draft framework was well put together.

Mr. Kramer stated it would be helpful to have this framework so he can deploy resources and get information and make it clear to the Flood Authority where this is heading, give an opportunity to comment, and understand what the Flood Authority can do for specific improvement to the capital project list.

Mr. Vander Stoep thought it was a good job of outlining the categories. Regarding the dam, we have learned that there are other projects whether a dam goes forward or not and that is what #1 recognizes. All these things are linked and we can't go forward and forget one or another of the elements.

Regarding #3 it would not be possible for this group or the Governor to say 'let's build a dam today.' All we have is a preliminary design of two options: a multi-purpose dam or one for flood control only. Those designs are not sophisticated enough to start permitting – there is not enough information. Creating the engineering and determining the best The type of dam will require more time and financing for engineering and analysis of which ~~that~~ will work best for fish and water quality.

Safety has to be ~~discussed~~ examined further. No one will support building a dam if that site is not safe. The state will not spend the money to build something that has any realistic risk of collapsing or causing damage. The preliminary analysis shows the site appears to be safe but more information needs to be gathered on engineering and geo-tech. He does not believe that anyone can decide yet whether there will be a dam or not. If the group moves forward on #3 it is not going to be to say yes, we will ~~build a dam~~ start building a dam now.

Mr. Kramer broached the subject of additional Flood Authority meetings. The rationale is there are a number of pieces of information that the "Governor's Group" (the name decided on rather than Chehalis Work Group) needs to be developed. The dam is one. The Group will get that information by their meeting on October 22. Their last meeting will be on November 5 and the Flood Authority will meet again on October 18. The meeting on the 22nd will be the point where they will have detail for input from the Flood Authority and Mr. Kramer proposed an additional meeting between October 22 and November 5.

Discussion followed and the meeting was established for Thursday, November 1 from 9 a.m. to noon. The location is to be determined, but Mr. Kramer will try for the Great Wolf Lodge (for free) or the Timberland Regional Center if a room is available.

Commissioner Willis thought it sounded as if the Governor's group would have the ability to change something before bringing it back to the Flood Authority. Mr. Kramer stated the group could make recommendations that are different from the Authority but it would be noted to the Governor.

Break – the Flood Authority recessed at 10:47 and reconvened at 11:00.

6. Jobs Now Projects

Mr. Boettcher handed out the Funding Status paper for projects that have been moved forward. There were five categories for funding: levees and dikes; Sickman Ford Bridge; installation of rain gage on the Chehalis Reservation; evacuation routes and critter pads; improvement affected by Satsop River. The Flood Authority makes a motion to obligate funds, sends that to the Tribe and then to OFM who sets up the contract. Projects being funded by OFM are the Adna project, the rain gage on the reservation, and critter pads. The Flood Authority approved several design projects and those forms were signed by Chairman Raines and are waiting for the Tribe's signature.

Commissioner Averill stated the airport levee project was approved by the Lewis County BOCC on Monday and it should go to OFM shortly.

Mr. Boettcher stated the Flood Authority projects are now on Google Maps. Each project can be opened and the review and approval forms have been posted. He explained the icons: clouds are rain gages; yellow pins are projects waiting for the Tribe's signature; green pins are projects that have gone through the system; the purple pins are OFM report projects. Mr. Boettcher will send the link to the members.

Mr. Butch Ogden stated the Tribe did sign off on the critter pads. They had a concern that there was nothing for livestock on the reservation but it was learned that livestock is on leased land and all livestock has to be off by October 31, returning on April 1. OFM is currently working on a contract with the Conservation Commission. The Commission has \$350,000 to go towards this project. Permits are in hand and the RFP for construction went out for bid with a deadline of yesterday. Contracts should be awarded on Friday and hopefully at least one critter pad can be started on Monday. For one pad the Commission found alternative funding for an escape route; that is designed and permitted but got held up because there was not time for NRCS to do the cultural review.

Mr. Ogden also stated that he went back to Grays Harbor County and Thurston County to get more information on their critter pads. There are four operations in Thurston County that would benefit from this process but no land-owner contacts have been made because there is no funding to do that. Grays Harbor County did not come up with anyone who was interested at this time.

Mr. Ogden stated because of the extra money from the Commission there may be money left over when combined with the \$500,000. He suggested that the Authority use those funds for planning or permitting in Thurston County. He also suggested looking at other places where it could be used and get ready for next year's capital budget.

Mr. Kramer asked if action was needed by the Authority to fund Thurston County. Mr. Ogden stated he understands that the money would fund the critter pads on the list. If there is another project it would require an action.

Chairman Raines stated she was not opposed to the request but critter pads need to be constructed first. The legislation allowed the \$500,000 for critter pads.

Commissioner Averill stated that if the Conservation Commission put in \$350,000 the Authority could have a discussion about the leftover Conservation money. The Flood Authority did not direct that these four or five people are the ones for critter pads.

Mr. Kramer stated Mr. Ogden should see where this ends and he can work with Mr. Boettcher who will prepare the review and approval forms with the Conservation Commission as lead agency.

Commissioner Willis had put in a request to Mr. Kramer to look into forming a committee for processing permits. The projects she was concerned about will be in or near water which will require a comment process. She asked that the county, DOE, DNR, WDFW and perhaps the Army Corps of Engineers create a team so there is a process and guidance to get through the permitting process. Normally land owners need to go to each agency for permission. If something is missed the project might not go forward. Most or all of these groups are at the Flood Authority meetings and a team could be put together to expedite the process.

Mr. Johnson asked if the office of Regulatory Assistance could provide that function. That is their job – to look at cross-jurisdiction and agency involvement. Lewis County uses that agency and it has been very helpful.

Mr. Boettcher stated the office of Regulatory Assistance allows multi-agency permitting teams which solve the problems that Commissioner Willis mentioned. He could send information for everyone to review. There is allowance for such things.

Mr. Kramer asked Commissioner Willis if there are projects that she thinks are ready for this step now. Commissioner Willis said no, but there will be – the Kersh project is one of them. Her thought was to plan ahead and act accordingly. She does not want the permitting to delay the project.

Mr. Kramer stated one of Mr. Boettcher's duties is to contact the right agency to initiate multiple agencies coming together. He asked if Commissioner Willis would like some of Mr. Boettcher's time dedicated to this process. Commissioner Willis responded she would like to see that when the time is appropriate.

Commissioner Averill stated once there is a budget item and the project is started then the process should be in place. Chairman Raines stated it would be a good idea to combine projects to reduce the cost.

Mr. Boettcher stated in the past he has set up a multi-agency permitting team and they worked on the projects and other projects would seek them out. It's possible the team could rove and do all the projects.

Mr. Kramer stated there is support for that concept and Mr. Boettcher can initiate that at the proper time.

Mr. Swartout wanted them to be sure the design phase has all the information for the permitting phase.

Chairman Raines altered the agenda to allow enough time at the afternoon session for discussion/action on some topics.

9. Public Comment

There was no public comment.

10. Lunch

A lunch recess was called at 11:34 and the meeting resumed at 12:48.

7. Gage Maintenance – Update on funding by Flood Authority members

Mr. Boettcher distributed papers on the Early Warning System costs and member commitment. He had not yet heard from Grays Harbor County, Aberdeen, Chehalis or Napavine.

Mr. Pinn stated this item would be on the council's agenda next Tuesday. Mr. MacReynold stated Chehalis would pay Chehalis' share. Commissioner Willis asked that the 2013 amount be put in the preliminary budget. She was surprised by the amount due the second half of 2012 and would bring that up for discussion with the BOCC. She was not sure if the BOCC had seen the website and she would like them to review it and perhaps see a demonstration. December 3 will be the approval of the budget.

Commissioner Averill stated the WEST contract is running the state fiscal year which started July 1. This is not funded by the capital budget and Lewis County has not yet paid WEST anything. WEST has made a commitment for the subscription for the website which is \$3000. It is necessary to get the first and second fiscal payment made.

Mr. Pinn asked if the total amount per jurisdiction would change if the Flood Authority loses a member. Mr. Kramer stated that would be the next topic for discussion.

Commissioner Averill stated there is no billing process for this particular requirement. The cities are concerned that the auditor will question this. A solution might be that Chairman Raines drafts a letter stating that the Flood Authority passed the requirement to pay and Lewis County as fiscal agent can bill the jurisdictions.

Commissioner Valenzuela stated the amounts that appear in the August memo are different from this paper. Mr. Boettcher stated he was to put together a cost with a $\frac{1}{4}$ payment and in later discussion about implementing the billing the amounts were two quarters and two quarters.

Commissioner Averill stated the first block is the annual cost. Anticipating that the annual cost will be similar next year, the jurisdictions will want to budget their portion of that amount. Half will be paid in the first half of 2013 and then the rest will be paid in the next fiscal year, or quarterly.

Mr. Swartout asked if this was considered an interim process to keep the system running until there is a funding source. Mr. Kramer stated yes.

Mr. Kramer stated it is still unknown whether Aberdeen will pull out of the Flood Authority. Chairman Raines will attend Aberdeen's council meeting next week.

Commissioner Averill stated calculations were based on population and Aberdeen represents a substantial cost. Chairman Raines stated the Flood Authority should move forward with what has been discussed. She did not want to jump to conclusions and that Mr. Cook didn't think Public Works understood the situation and he has not been able to make a public comment. The Chair was not expecting any representation from Aberdeen at today's meeting and their council needs to be approached so they understand the legislation and what the Flood Authority is trying to do.

Mr. Johnson stated there is no funding agreement and this is how we will determine payment. It takes about three weeks for a contract with WEST and he asked to be informed well in advance of when he should start working on that contract.

Mr. Kramer reiterated that the Chair will send out a letter to the jurisdictions followed up with an invoice. Mr. Swartout asked where in that process is the ILA signed to send payments. Mr. Kramer stated this is not funding based on the ILA but one jurisdiction billing another based on a recommendation. Mr. Carter stated there is no need for an amendment but an agreement among the members as to how that is done. Lewis County will be billing each jurisdiction separately.

Mr. MacReynold clarified that the jurisdictions will take it to their councils and will agree; the Flood Authority will take a formal action and the Chair will send out a letter and the jurisdictions will get an invoice from Lewis County. A step cannot be missed because the jurisdictions will be audited.

8. Preparation for Upcoming Flood Season

Mr. Boettcher asked how prepared and ready we are if the next flood comes within the next couple of months. There are a lot of different ways to look at readiness and he has cataloged his ideas and would like input in setting priorities. When he thinks about emergency management he thinks about citizen readiness, the Early Warning System, first responder, emergency management plans, coordinated plans, exercises, supply lines, etc.

The discussion paper Mr. Boettcher distributed shows what each jurisdiction has in place for flood preparedness. It shows there are systems in place and there is a need to participate in outreach events. The other paper has nine items recommended for an op-ed piece.

Mr. Kramer stated flood preparedness and response is organized county by county. The Flood Authority should not be involved with that. He thought whatever is being done is being done very well and he does not want the Flood Authority to be the place people are contacting. The op-ed piece should be pointed towards the county. People should not be confused about where to go for information. The op-ed piece could have a little more focus on the counties' resources and focus on the Early Warning System and website.

Commissioner Valenzuela referred to #9 and asked if there is an easier entry to the Early Warning System. Mr. Boettcher stated that Dr. Curtis said the Flood Authority could pay an additional fee for a non-password entry for \$2000 annually. He asked if he should explore this option.

Commissioner Valenzuela stated Thurston County coordinates emergency response and the Early Warning System would be a Thurston County message and it needs to be obvious and easy for people to log on.

Mr. Pinn agreed that the Contrail website is cumbersome. Regarding the value points: focus on the County for supporting their activities and make the media aware, including radio and TV.

Commissioner Willis stated Grays Harbor County has good things in place that will be complimentary to the Flood Authority. Regarding Contrail and One Rain – what do we name it and how can we get to it before we pay the bill? It is hard to get to so why should the Flood Authority pay for it?

Mr. MacReynold thought the recommendations were good and #4 was the best. Chehalis is doing this.

Mr. Pinn asked if there was a possibility of running county exercises with the Flood Authority supporting that. Mr. Boettcher stated he had spoken to Ross McDowell, LC Emergency Management, and he said all the counties are in Homeland Security Region 3 and a coordinator might want to work with all three counties. Mr. McDowell thought it was a good idea.

Mr. Boettcher stated he would talk to Dr. Curtis about password ease. Mr. Kramer stated this has to happen quickly and Dr. Curtis needs to understand that if there is an additional cost it is not covered.

Mr. Kramer summed up the tasks: he would work with Ms. Fund on the op-ed piece; encourage Homeland Security to work in inter-county boundaries; talk to Dr. Curtis about the constraints the Flood Authority is under and a longer-term solution for the website.

BUSINESS MEETING

1. Call to Order

Chairman Raines called the business meeting to order at 1:30 p.m.

2. Introductions

Introductions were waived.

3. Approval of Agenda

Chairman Raines asked to amend the agenda to give the Financial Report in item & since the gage maintenance had already been discussed. The agenda was approved with the amendment.

4. Approval of August 16 meeting notes

Chairman Raines asked if there were any changes or correction to the meeting notes. Mr. Estes stated there was a discrepancy in the cost of the gage maintenance from the meeting notes to the current paper. Commissioner Averill stated it was an estimate in the meeting notes. Chairman Raines suggested the meeting notes stand. There were no other corrections. The notes were approved.

5. Public Comment

There was no public comment.

6. Reports

a. Chair's Report

Chairman Raines received an email from the Quinault Indian Nation requesting a meeting. She will keep the Authority informed about that meeting. She received comments on the Alternatives report which was forwarded and included in the comments.

b. Member Reports

Montesano – Mayor Estes stated Parametrix did a report on the erosion and flooding on Mary's River.

Lewis County – Commissioner Averill stated Lewis County has a contract on the Adna project and passed a motion for a contract for the airport levee.

Centralia – Ms. Fund stated next month Centralia will be accepting grants for rain gardens and deciding if they will contribute to that funding.

Grays Harbor County – Commissioner Willis stated the work is continuing on the Satsop and Kersh projects. The Tribe is working on the Sickman Ford Bridge and Grays Harbor is keeping in touch with them. The county engineer has been forwarded all projects within the county and he is looking those over.

Thurston County – Commissioner Valenzuela stated the Commissioners set a public hearing for flood plain regulations to line up with the new FEMA maps.

Chehalis – Mr. MacReynold thanked the Flood Authority for Phase I of the airport levee and for the county being the fiscal agent and assigning Public Works to work on it. It should go out for bid soon. He could not speak on the new Flood Authority representative. Chehalis City Council has interviewed three candidates and the final selection will be made at next week's meeting.

Napavine – Mr. Pinn stated the Napavine City Council will be voting on the allocation for gages next Tuesday.

Cosmopolis – Ms. Raines stated Cosmopolis has a new website which will have new maps with planning stages for emergency preparedness.

c. Correspondence

There was no correspondence.

d. State Team Report

Mr. Nelson stated he will participate in the discussion regarding scoping for a dam as an option for retention as well as alternatives to water retention.

Ms. Powe stated she is looking for help in funding the operations and maintenance on the gages but has not had any luck so far. Congresswoman Herrera-Beutler wants to introduce language in the transportation bill to not use walls for a flood solution. She has spoken to the Governor about this and the Governor is sincerely looking for basin-wide solutions and the Congresswoman will not introduce that language at this time.

7. Financial Report

Mr. Johnson stated page one of the report is the breakdown of expenses to date. Page two is the budgeted amount and encumbered funds. There is no money left for items not already encumbered and the Flood Authority must be diligent.

Commissioner Averill asked why the expense for GTH was so large. Mr. Johnson stated it includes past money to Ms. Fowler and Ms. Ligon's expenses to date.

There were no other questions.

8. Approval of Project Criteria

Mr. Kramer stated at the morning meeting there were various types of impacts that may be mitigated and also a category to identify public and PUD support for the project. With those suggestions he asked for consensus to support the projects discussed at that meeting. There were thumbs up all around.

9. Confirm Next Meeting

The next regular meeting will be on October 18 in Chehalis at the courthouse. A meeting on November 1 has been scheduled for 9am to 12pm, location to be determined. The Project Committee will meet before that.

Mr. Kersh stated the public did not have an opportunity to send in their comments. He is still concerned about tidal influence and would like it to get some consideration.

Chairman Raines stated the Alternatives Report did have comments from individuals and many articles. She encouraged him to look at those. She stated the Flood Authority is aware of the tidal influence and it would not be overlooked.

Mr. Vander Stoep stated the Flood Authority passed funding for that study and was waiting for the Tribe to sign off. If the study is done quickly the information will go to the governor. Mr. Kersh stated tidal influence in general needs to be considered.

Adjourn

There was no other business before the Authority and adjournment was at 2:16 p.m.